



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,093	02/11/2002	Michael Porter	JJ-11 028US	1553

24962 7590 02/04/2003

DENNISON ASSOCIATES  
133 RICHMOND STREET WEST  
SUITE 301  
TORONTO, ON M5H 2L7  
CANADA

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, KIEN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3712

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/071,093	PORTER, MICHAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kien T. Nguyen	3712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichimaru U.S. Patent 5,393,063 in view of Wood et al U.S. Patent 5,868,388 and Nelson U.S. Patent 3,788,645.

Ichimaru disclosed a three-dimensional puzzle comprising a plurality of interconnected cubes, the puzzle comprising one piece with one small cube (8) (Fig. 2), one piece with three small cubes (10) (Fig. 2), and one piece with six small cubes (11) (Fig. 2). It is noted that Ichimaru failed to teach six pieces with four small cubes and six pieces with five small cubes as set forth in claim 1. However, Wood et al teaches it is known in the art to provide a three-dimensional puzzle with at least 6 pieces with five small cubes as shown Fig. 1; and Nelson teaches it is known in the art to provide a three-dimensional puzzle with six pieces with four small cubes as shown in Fig. 3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the puzzle of Ichimaru with the puzzle pieces as taught by Wood et al and Nelson for the advantage of expanding the difficulty of the puzzle.

Regarding claim 2, although the combination of Ichimaru, Wood et al, and Nelson disclosed the cubes made by material such as polyester resin instead of wood, such wooden cubes in puzzle pieces are very well known in the art and it does not wood has

any significant advantage over other equivalent material. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the cubes of the combination Ichimaru, Wood et al, and Nelson with any equivalent material such as wood to accommodate any type of user and cost.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, these claims appear to recite only the intended uses of the puzzle cubes, the puzzle cubes of Wood et al could be used in computer games (see column 14, lines 56-67). Accordingly, the combination of Ichimaru, Wood et al and Nelson is certainly capable of being used in any computer or electronic application.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The enclosed references are cited for interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kien T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-2493. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (703) 308-1745. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3579 for regular communications and (703) 305-3579 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.



Kien T. Nguyen  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3712

Ktn  
January 30, 2003